

**REMARKS**

The following claims are pending in the application: 1 – 12

The following claims have been amended: 1 and 10

The following claims have been deleted: 5

The following claims have been added: 13 – 16

As a result of the foregoing Amendment, the following claims remain pending in the application: 1 – 16.

**The Objection to the Drawing**

The drawing has been objected to because all numeric blocks need to be labeled with descriptive legends according to 37 CFR 1.84(o). The drawing has also been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner requires that the “signal generator” and “external monitoring station” must be shown.

Applicant has amended Figures 1 and 2 to include descriptive legends in accordance with the Examiner’s requirement. With regard to Figure 1, Applicant has placed the descriptive legends in a table so as to reduce clutter within the figure. Applicant has additionally added “signal generator” and “external monitoring station” to the figures as required by the Examiner.

**The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

The Examiner rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

the applicant regards as the invention – specifically taking the position that the phrase “such as” renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to more accurately claim the subject matter of the present invention and respectfully submits that no new matter has been entered in doing so.

Comments on contents of this Response

In response to the office action of January 18, 2005, we enclose a set of amended claims including amended claim 1 and new claims 13 to 16. Original claim 5 is hereby deleted.

Amended claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 5 and new claim 13 comprises a combination of original claims 1, 2, 3 and 6, which the Examiner indicated were allowable in the light of the presently cited art.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejects claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stanley-Arslanok et al. (US 5,225,806).

In relation to US 5,225,806, Examiner appreciates that this disclosure is exemplified by Figure 5 where it is shown that in various modes A...F, “groups” of sensors may be selectively armed so that if one or more sensors of an armed group trips, an alarm is raised. However, there is no disclosure in ‘806 of storing a “sequence”

of sensor events to determine whether a detected sequence of events should raise an alarm. As such, Applicant submits that claim 1 as filed is novel vis-à-vis this disclosure.

On the other hand, GB 2,194,089, is more relevant and does disclose the storing of sequences of sensor events. However, in common with existing systems '089 discloses placing the system in an armed mode and when a sequence of events matches a stored sequence of events an alarm is raised.

Contrary to the teaching of '089, the present invention as claimed in amended claim 1, teaches a panel which is always armed as it is continually monitoring for sequences of events which do not match permitted stored sequences of events before generating an alarm.

Examiner will appreciate that as amended claim 1 is novel vis-à-vis the cited material and teaches diametrically away from the cited material, the claim is allowable in the light of the cited material.

Applicant therefore requests that unless more relevant prior art is produced, Examiner re-consider the application and find the amended claims allowable in the light of the enclosed amendments.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanley-Arslanok et al. (US 5,225,806).

Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments advanced above rebutting the §102(b) rejection and respectfully states that as the cited reference fails to teach each

and every element of the present invention as currently claimed, that the outstanding rejection may be properly withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects claims 9 through 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanley-Arslanok et al. (US 5,225,0860 in view of Naidoo et al (US 6,658,091).

Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments advanced above rebutting the §102(b) rejection and respectfully submits that Naidoo fails to cure the deficiencies of Stanley-Arslanok in rendering the present invention an obvious variation of the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's outstanding rejection may be properly withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendment and accompanying remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is properly in condition for allowance and may be passed to issuance upon payment of the appropriate fees.

Telephone inquiry to the undersigned in order to clarify or otherwise expedite prosecution of the subject application is respectfully encouraged.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLIE SHERLOCK

Date: 2-28-05

By:



Michael Stonebrook

Registration No.: 53,851  
Standley Law Group LLP  
495 Metro Place South, Suite 210  
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319  
Telephone: (614) 792-5555  
Facsimile: (614) 792-5536